

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above Claims. Claims 1-8 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 have been amended. Claims 1-8 are rejected. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koshikawa (JP 03095717 A), in view of United States Patent Number 6,396,667 to Zhang. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are not rendered unpatentable over Koshikawa in view of Zhang for the following rational.

Applicants have amended Independent Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 to include the feature of a portion of the slider protruding from an opening in the airflow shroud such that the portion is exposed and not surrounded by the airflow shroud. Support for this feature can be found at least on page 7, paragraph 31 which states “about 50-100 micrometers of the slider 804 is exposed as it extends out of opening 702, as indicated by d.”

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (MPEP 2143.03).

Applicants submit that Koshikawa, alone or in combination with Zhang fails to teach or suggest the feature of a portion of the slider protruding from the shroud. Particularly, Koshikawa teaches away from this claimed feature by stating in the purpose portion of the abstract “to completely cover the upper side and four sides of a head slider.”

Koshikawa covers all sides of the slider with the exception of the ABS such that the slider does not protrude to improve magnetic shielding. Embodiments of the present invention are for airflow shielding and resultantly, a portion of the slider protrudes from the shroud such that a portion of the slider is not surrounded by the shroud. With the present claimed invention, the airflow shroud buffers airflow such that even though a

portion of the slider protrudes from the shroud, off-track positional disturbances caused by airflow are minimal.

Zhang fails to remedy the deficiencies of Koshikawa. Resultantly, Applicants submit Koshikawa, alone and in combination with Zhang fails to teach a protruding portion of a slider and therefore submit that Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 are patentable over Koshikawa in view of Zhang. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed and Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 be allowed.

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koshikawa in view of Mei (6,611,399). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 4 and 8 are not rendered unpatentable over Koshikawa in view of Mei for the following rational.

As stated above, Applicants have amended Independent Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 to include the feature of a portion of the slider protruding from an opening in the airflow shroud such that the portion is exposed and not surrounded by the airflow shroud.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (MPEP 2143.03).

Applicants submit that Koshikawa, alone or in combination with Mei fails to teach or suggest the feature of a portion of the slider protruding from the shroud. Particularly, Koshikawa teaches away from this claimed feature by stating in the purpose portion of the abstract “to completely cover the upper side and four sides of a head slider.”

Mei fails to remedy the deficiencies of Koshikawa. Resultantly, Applicants submit Koshikawa, alone and in combination with Mei fails to teach a protruding portion

of a slider and therefore submit that Claims 4 and 8 are patentable over Koshikawa in view of Mei. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed and Claims 4 and 8 be allowed.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-8 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: 12/5/07, 2007



John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398
123 Westridge Dr.
Watsonville, Ca
95076